THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOUSING AUTHORITY

+ + + + +

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS EMERGENCY MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY
SEPTEMBER 19, 2018

+ + + + +

The Board of Commissioners met in the Boardroom, 1133 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., at 10:30 a.m., Neil Albert, Chairman, presiding.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

NEIL ALBERT, Chairman
WILLIAM SLOVER, Vice Chairman
KENNETH D. COUNCIL, Commissioner
KEN GROSSINGER, Commissioner
BRIAN KENNER, Commissioner
JOSE ORTIZ GAUD, Commissioner
FRANSELENE ST. JEAN, Commissioner
AQUARIUS VANN-GHASRI, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT:

TYRONE GARRETT, Executive Director ALETHEA MCNAIR, Manager of Board Relations

COMMISSIONER(S) ABSENT:

FRANK LANCASTER
NAKEISHA NEAL JONES

CONTENTS

Call to Order [Moment of Silence] and Quorum	3
Approval of Minutes	4
Resolutions A. Resolution 18-08	
B. Resolution 18-20 Public Comment	
Announcements	
Adiournment	34

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	10:30 a.m.
3	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Good morning.
4	Today's date is September 19, 2018 at DCHA's
5	headquarters, 1133 North Capital Street, N.E.,
6	Washington, D.C. The time is 10:30 a.m. We're
7	going to ask everyone to please silence your phones
8	and other electronic devices. As is our custom,
9	at this time we'll observe a moment of silence.
10	Thank you.
11	We do reserve time for public
12	testimony. There's no one signed up to testify or
13	to provide comments on the resolutions that would
14	be before us today. So what we'll do right now is
15	move into roll call.
16	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Thank you.
17	Commissioner Council?
18	COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Present.
19	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
20	Grossinger?
21	COMMISSIONER GROSSINGER: Here.
22	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner

1	Grossinger is present via phone. Commissioner
2	Kenner?
3	COMMISSIONER KENNER: Here.
4	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
5	Lancaster?
6	(No response.)
7	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
8	Neal Jones?
9	(No response.)
LO	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
L1	Ortiz Gaud?
L2	COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Here.
L3	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
L 4	St. Jean?
L5	COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Here.
L6	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
L7	Vann-Ghasri?
L8	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Present.
L9	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
20	Slover?
21	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Present.
22	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Chairman
	NEAL R. GROSS

Albert?
CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Present.
COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: We have eight
commissioners. You have a quorum.
CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Next
item on our agenda is the approval of the minutes.
We had an emergency Board of Commissioners meeting
on September 7th, 2018. The minutes were loaded
to your Board books a while back. I hope you've
had an opportunity to review the minutes, and I'd
entertain a motion to approve the minutes. Is
there a motion? Is there a second? All in favor
say aye. Any opposed?
The first resolution is Resolution
18-08, which will authorize the conveyance of
Square 7695 Lot 825 to WC Smith Company for the
purposes of constructing a commercial use
building. At this time, I'm going to turn it over
to our Executive Director to provide a brief
description, and then we'll move into Board action.
COMMISSIONER GARRETT: Good morning,

Commissioners. Good morning to the public also.

I'm also going to ask that Mr. Malone, Merrick Malone, and also Ken Slaughter from OGC come up so they will be able to answer any questions that you may have in reference to this particular project.

As discussed, and we've been talking about it for some time, DCHA has the opportunity to participate in a transaction with WC Smith in which we would convey our adjoining parcel of land at 769 South to WC Smith for the purposes of constructing a ten-story office space for a future lease opportunity. Based on the construction of the deal, the Housing Authority would receive a benefit from the proceeds after the transaction, after construction of the building, lease-up, and stabilization period which we expect approximately three years. After that point in time, the Housing Authority, DCHA, would receive 50 percent of the sales proceeds after all fees have been paid.

The reason we're doing it in that manner is because the Housing Authority is unable to participate in the transaction in any other way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Conveyance of the property in this matter would be in the best interest of the Housing Authority. And as I stated, Mr. Slaughter and both Mr. Slaughter and Mr. Malone are here to answer any further questions as any arise.

COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Somebody say that, DCHA, we need to also begin to look at our deals and provide opportunities for small businesses in the District of Columbia and my constituents who may have a reason for these deals because there's usually nothing in these deals to benefit my constituents other than construction jobs.

I have several questions that I do want to ask. One of the questions is how does the refinance, if there is a refinance in this deal, how does it benefit DCHA? I also want to know if the 50/50, and we are not the developers, what's in it really for us and what are the possibilities and how does this benefit my constituents or DCHA in actuality and whether or not there are any deed restrictions in this deal and, if so, could you

share them with us? And what is the minimum commercial grade real estate that applies to this deal, and how is the closing costs in this deal, how is it negotiated?

That's a lot. First of PARTICIPANT: all, the way the deal is structured, we had our land appraised during an appraisal and it was \$5 million When this land was valued at on parcel. \$7 million, and so the way the deal is structured, as the Executive Director pointed out, when we started down this road in April, we thought we would be part of that deal, that we would do part of the ground lease, part of the joint venture, and we would be able to move forward in that manner. Obviously, we have some impediments, legal impediments, that were discussed, and we had to move to a transaction of sale.

Now, initially, the vision of the post-sale or refinancing, so, in other words, their option is that after three years or possibly five that the building would be refinanced and, at that time, we would then split after the waterfall. So

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

understand we're not the developer, so there would be developer fees that have to come out of that, construction costs. But after that -- oh, and also closing fees that would have to come out of that.

But after that, then DCHA would receive its \$5 million for its land before William C. Smith took on their land value, which would be at \$7 million, before there would be any equity that would be put in the deal. So in the waterfall, we're right at the front, in other words, after construction and fees are paid for.

So, initially, when the deal was 54/46, which was the last time we were before the Commissioners, we talked about the ability to be close to \$7.9 million. Now with the 50/50 percent, 50/50 split, if all things work out, then that number would go up to \$9.7 million.

Now, the risks that we talked about still remain because there was a decision made by the Board that they wanted to stay in the deal and reinvest in that deal and participate, which is why we would be able to reap the upside on some of this.

But it also has the risks which I pointed out, which are the cap rate risks pointed out in the presentation. If the cap rate is at, for instance, a 5.25, we would realize the \$9.7 million. We're still subject to the cap rate sensitivity, as well as the market. Obviously, when we started out, the construction costs have increased and it certainly impacted the project.

If those market, if that cap rate shifts another 25-percent higher, then the higher it goes there will be greater the reduction and the contribution to both William C. Smith, as well as DCHA.

Now, what we would be doing with those monies would be, in fact, become part of program income and we would reinvest those monies back into our residential development, our misuse development primarily in the capital area. So that's what we would be doing with that money is reinvesting it back into our housing and our development, at least for the remainder of the development of the remaining process of Campus

1	Carrollsburg.
2	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner
3	Kenner, do you have any question or comments?
4	Commissioner St. Jean, do you have any questions
5	or comments?
6	COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: No.
7	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Commissioner
8	Council, questions or comments? Commissioner
9	Slover?
10	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Yes, a few
11	questions. This resolution has been around for a
12	bit. It's Resolution 18-08. I believe it first
13	surfaced in May or thereabouts. There was also an
14	emergency meeting scheduled August 10th, in
15	essence, to review this very resolution. It never
16	became before the Board. What was the reason that
17	it was never brought to the Board on August the
18	10th?
19	PARTICIPANT: I asked that it be taken
20	off the Board because I didn't believe that the deal
21	was negotiated to the liking of the Board.
22	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: And what

particular elements? Because really, fundamentally, not much has changed and, in fact, when this was rescheduled it was exactly the same as it was then. And I understand that since then maybe there's been a little bit of move-up to 50/50 of what's left at the bottom of the waterfall, which is another issue I'd like to discuss. But when this was re-introduced to the Board in this second emergency meeting for this very issue many months later, the deal had fundamentally not changed, so what got it back on the agenda?

PARTICIPANT: So I think I'll disagree with you that the deal hasn't fundamentally changed. Ι think the deal has fundamentally When we started talking about this in changed. May, the splits were, and staff can correct me if I'm wrong, I think 46 percent, 58/42. This board has repeatedly said that that's not sufficient, even though the portion of our property is smaller than the portion that Smith will be contributed to this development. We thought our leverage was stronger, and so we sent a team back to negotiate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

a stronger position.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

So we're now at 50/50 splits. We just went into a conversation about when those funds become available, what the waterfalls are. But we've seen an 8-percent movement positive.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: You're not addressing my concern. My concern was August 10th we had a 46-percent --

COMMISSIONER GROSSINGER: I'm sorry.

Could you say that again? I couldn't hear what you said.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: He's not addressing my concern, which is August 10th we had fundamentally the same deal which we were presented on this resolution that I have, which is the same percentage. So I was wondering why we didn't vote on this August 10th or at the general board meeting we had a week ago, but I'll move on. I do think there's something to look into there. It's unusual to have this many emergency meetings about the same issue and have as many meetings passed as we have and fundamentally be at the same place. So

I'll move on.

2.1

This deal started in 2003, I believe, with Resolution 03-02. And in Resolution 03-02, we had contemplated, the Board at that time moved forward with contemplating that this would be a joint venture deal, that we would be a joint venture partner, and that was the reason that the Board at that time was okay with using this as a commercial piece of real estate versus residential, given that we're in the residential business. The Board, at that time, I assume felt that we would make enough money to make it worth not using this as residential.

Fast-forwarding, we now have been, when we originally were brought this deal, as you said, Mr. Malone, it was a joint venture structure but, subsequently, something happened. Can you explain? I understand there were some conversations about our capacity to participate as a joint venture. Do you have it in writing from anybody saying that they can't do this?

PARTICIPANT: Let me address that.

1	This is Ken Slaughter, general counsel. And as you
2	have heard, when the deal was contemplating at
3	least from DGS, the District's leasing agency, on
4	behalf of Department of Transportation, the
5	lawyers representing the District raised a
6	longstanding issue, which is a question about our
7	subsidiaries participating in such deals with the
8	District. When the original resolution was
9	passed, I don't believe you contemplated or you
10	knew who the tenant might be. You certainly agreed
11	to do a commercial building and combine the two
12	properties.
13	Fortunately, a government lease was
14	proposed and that triggered scrutiny by the
15	Attorney General's office that resulted in our
16	advice that we not, and we couldn't get it resolved
17	in time to do this transaction. We disagreed with
18	them but
19	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Do you have
20	anything in writing?
21	PARTICIPANT: Do I have anything in
22	writing?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Or you just had a conversation?

PARTICIPANT: I've had conversations with the DGS. I didn't ask for it in writing.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Well, this is an enormous decision based on a conversation and not something in writing, and so I feel like we've been sort of skirting or avoiding this issue and it's arbitrary. It arrives in opportune times, and it seems that we engage on very similar situations in very similar capacities on other issues and other engagement with the city, yet this becomes a problem. PARTICIPANT: Well, the city is going to participate as our tenant, because the lawyers have questioned our ability to operate in the way that we contemplated in a joint venture. It has only come up one other time that I'm aware of. At the direction of Mr. Garrett and the Chair also asking that we clarify. We have received our position that the city is wrong, and we think we're making progress on that. just haven't We completed our negotiation with the city.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	letting it just surface, we are attempting to
2	extinguish it as an issue in our transactions with
3	the city.
4	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So April, May,
5	June, July, August, and half of September to
6	resolve this issue?
7	PARTICIPANT: We've had several years
8	to resolve it actually, Mr. Slover.
9	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Well, it seems
10	it's not going away, and so it just seems
11	PARTICIPANT: It hasn't gone away in
12	time for this transaction. That doesn't mean it's
13	not going away, sir.
14	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So moving on,
15	Resolution 03-02 also called for the only way that
16	we would participate, the only way we could convey
17	the land in a commercial structure was through a
18	lease or a joint venture participation. So we're
19	going against Resolution 03-02 under this
20	contemplated transaction.
21	PARTICIPANT: Which you are free to do.
22	By voting up the transaction proposed now, you can

1	change or combine on the structure in the form of
2	a deal
3	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Did the
4	PARTICIPANT: purview of this
5	board.
6	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Did the
7	resolution need to come back to the Board? Do you
8	need Board authority to do this?
9	PARTICIPANT: We are seeking Board
10	authority.
11	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Do you need it?
12	PARTICIPANT: We think we do, yes.
13	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Because
14	Resolution 03-02 says that any, you cite that in
15	Resolution 18-08 that Resolution 03-02 gave you the
16	authority to execute all deeds, ground leases, and
17	other documents necessary or desirable in
18	connection with the disposition of this property.
19	PARTICIPANT: Mr. Slover, I'm sure you
20	agree with Mr. Garrett's view that resolutions of
21	that age need a fresh approval, especially when the
22	structure is not what was contemplated in the old

1	resolution.
2	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: That's a
3	departure from traditional operating
4	philosophies.
5	PARTICIPANT: This is
6	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: I just want to
7	ask is that a departure from traditional operating
8	policy?
9	PARTICIPANT: I'm not certain that I
10	can respond to that.
11	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Okay.
12	PARTICIPANT: It's in the eyes of the
13	beholder, sir.
14	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Moving on to
15	the structure, so originally the deal was
16	contemplated that we would do this joint venture,
17	we would participate in all the fees. It moved
18	around and changed. Then we came back with the
19	land cost, and it was a little higher than \$5
20	million, and then there was some discussion about
21	how construction costs had moved up and, therefore,

the land value moves down, which doesn't make a lot

of sense to me given the fact that we're selling the land into the deal, right? Correct?

PARTICIPANT: We're selling the land, yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So it doesn't make sense. Our land value is our land value. What they do with it is irrelevant to me. In other words, they should take less on the exit and we should take more on the front. So that's a personal opinion, and so I'm just curious how it's moving around like that.

But when I get really concerned about this deal is that we're giving land and we're not getting any money for three years. So, traditionally, when you sell your land, you get money. Since this 50/50 joint venture or whatever we're calling it, we all know that the bottom of the waterfall can be whatever the person in control wants it to be. And so what I get concerned with is we have no control over costs, we have no control over what the preferred equity is, we have no control over anything. And so what is at the

bottom of the waterfall is up to WC Smith, and what I'd be concerned with is WC Smith has not proven to be a partner who has done what they say they're going to do. We've gone through it once already this year.

So my concern is we're giving them our land at no cost to them. They're going to get to carry that \$5 million without any debt, so they get to take that land and pay nothing until they have liquidity, so it's a free carry for them on our And so our money is locked up for three years or five and our control is given completely to them as to what we get back, if anything. And given the fact that we've been in a couple of situations where things didn't turn out the way we wanted them to, particularly with this developer, I have real concerns about entering the deal structure that you have contemplated right now based on the history and based on the fact that I just don't think it's a good thing to do with our land. I'd love to hear some response as to why that's not accurate.

PARTICIPANT: Commissioner, I think

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

let's go back. I think there was an opportunity that we laid out what the risks were associated with this. We've also got an appraisal for what our land is actually contemplated or worth at this time. We made it very clear to the commissioners that there was an opportunity to take the \$5 million at the time and receive the \$5 million in our bank by the end of the calendar year in December. That was the initial.

I think we've pointed out the risk, the market rate risk. With the market risk, we pointed out the cap rate risk. And there was a decision made that we would do the \$5 million and put it back into the deal itself. We laid out the risk associated with both, doing both. And so we came back, we got the 50/50. I understand those waterfall risks, and, in fact, we negotiated the waterfall in a way that, actually, right after construction costs -- and we have also looked at their pro forma, Commissioner, to make sure that their pro forma was reasonable and we did that in conjunction with our department and also with our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

consultants to make sure.

Now, obviously, in development, we know things can happen, and that's why we kept emphasizing the market risks that are associated when you do a development. At the same time, they are taking on the responsibility, meaning Smith, of building the building and all of those risks that are associated with this, that kind of thing.

We could, as we presented early, have taken the \$5 million, which is the value of our land, and exited, so there was a decision to make that we invest that \$5 million.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So as I recall that discussion, and maybe there was just a communication gap, was that we were going to try to mimic a joint venture as best we could to try to mitigate the impact of this ambiguous or arbitrary surfacing of the Office of the Attorney General in opportune times. So, to me, that didn't mean being at the bottom of the waterfall, so maybe that was just a communication gap, but I think the risk that you're presenting here is significantly

higher than what I thought it would have been on a situation that we're looking at, which is a lock-down AAA tenant to D.C. government as a tenant in a building, little risk in terms of development, real risks in terms of a lot of things because of the tenant, and probably little cost to WC Smith given the fact that they can go bank this lease. And so I just feel like -- was there any consideration, when this thing started switching around, was there any consideration to shifting back to residential for the site and trying to attach it to 869 North? I know it's under construction. Is there any possibility of trying to put this land into there and trying to build residential here versus commercial since that's our mission? No, we did not do that. PARTICIPANT: I think you can go back for years, it had been our hope, both Smith and our hope that we would be able

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER:

to get a commercial tenant to build that, I mean,

it's almost been 13 years I think.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

But I think our

hope was based on a big liquidity event, and what 1 I'm saying is this is not as we thought it would 2 be; and, therefore, was any consideration given to 3 going back to building residential since that's the 4 5 business they were in? 6 PARTICIPANT: No, the answer is no. VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: 7 Then we could have taken that as an opportunity to get back the 8 38 CC units we lost to Smith earlier this year. 9 10 mean, I think that's a consideration. I know you 11 want to hurry along. 12 CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I just asked if you 13 have a lot of questions. Go ahead. 14 VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So Ι just, fundamentally, think that the way that this deal 15 has evolved and moved and been tabled and brought 16 17 back and tabled and brought back creates a lot of for 18 concern wonder there me. was 19 didn't discussions, the Board members have 20 discussions with WC Smith outside of a public Board Were there any conversations amongst 2.1 meeting?

Board members with the developer?

1	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: No, not
2	that I
3	COMMISSIONER KENNER: So WC Smith is a
4	partner with the city on numerous projects, and we
5	talk to William C. Smith all the time.
6	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: About this
7	particular site?
8	COMMISSIONER KENNER: Unfortunately,
9	for this one, there were no specific conversations
10	that I had about this specific piece. That is all
11	handled by the Department of General Services.
12	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I've had
13	conversations with Chris Smith on many issues from
14	time to time.
15	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Any related to
16	this specific issue?
17	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Not specific to this
18	issue.
19	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: And tell me
20	again why we didn't vote on August 10th? It was
21	simply because?
22	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I did not think, I

1	pulled it out of the agenda because I didn't think
2	the deal was negotiated to the benefit of the
3	Housing Department.
4	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Because I've
5	heard some whispering around that maybe it didn't
6	have the votes, so the city wasn't ready to build
7	because they wanted to build east of the river. I
8	mean, there's all sorts of stuff that surfaced.
9	Was that all rumor?
LO	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I don't deal in
L1	rumors.
L2	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So it was
L3	rumor?
L4	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I just said I don't
L5	deal in rumors. I can tell you why we didn't bring
L6	it up on August 10th.
L7	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: I would also
L8	like to add I had asked, at one point, would the
L9	developer have any access to the private alley that
20	we own since we're getting no consideration for it
21	in the deal because that's actually what was
22	reduced, our land didn't we put in the resolution

that they will not have any access to it during 1 construction and/or after? Why not? We're not 2 3 getting any --They actually have some 4 PARTICIPANT: 5 of the underground utilities that are underneath 6 that alley they actually financed. 7 actually put money into it. That's part of their pre-development costs that we probably would have 8 9 had --VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: So it's on our 10 11 land that we're not getting any value for? 12 PARTICIPANT: It's shared, the cost, because we're using it for 769 for the building that 13 14 we have under construction, so that was a joint, that was a joint agreement to do the utilities and 15 the vaults in terms of the underground within the 16 17 alley because it's going to service both of our parcels. 18 19 Well, I don't VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: 20 have anymore questions. I think that this deal is not in the best interest of DCHA, it does not 2.1 22 fulfill our mission, it does not bring enough

1	potential external revenue to mitigate what we
2	would lose on the residential side, which is
3	essentially our mission. I know that we are only
4	66-percent done on fulfilling our obligation to
5	that site after 17 years, and so that's not a great
6	track record and I think that we should be focusing
7	all of our energy on residential and replacing
8	residential versus now two emergency meetings and
9	multiple, I don't know how many staff hours spent
10	on this. And to result in this I think is not the
11	best use of this agency's time.
12	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you,
13	Commissioner. Commissioner Jose Ortiz, any
14	questions or comments?
15	COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: No.
16	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: I will entertain a
17	motion to approve Resolution 18-08. Is there a
18	motion to approve? Is there a second?
19	COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Second.
20	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Second. Roll call.
21	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Thank you.
	II

1	COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: No.
2	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
3	Grossinger?
4	COMMISSIONER GROSSINGER: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
6	Kenner?
7	COMMISSIONER KENNER: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
9	Ortiz Gaud?
10	COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Yes.
11	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
12	St. Jean?
13	COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
15	Vann-Ghasri?
16	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: No.
17	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
18	Slover?
19	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: No.
20	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Chairman
21	Albert?
22	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.
	NEAL D. CDOCC

1	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: We have five
2	yes, three no. The resolution is approved.
3	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. Next
4	resolution
5	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: I'd like to
6	note that I don't think that Commissioner Kenner
7	should have voted on this, and I would like to
8	continue that discussion at some future date.
9	Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thanks. Resolution
11	18-20, to approve the District of Columbia Housing
12	Authority's operating budget for fiscal year 2019.
13	I'm going to ask our Executive Director to quickly
14	give us the highlights. As you may recall, Board
15	members, we asked for additional information from
16	our CFO, which was provided to us earlier today.
17	Are there any other questions that you'd like to
18	ask our CFO or our Executive Director before we vote
19	on this resolution?
20	Hearing none, I would entertain a
21	motion to approve Resolution 18-20.
22	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: So moved.

1	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Is there a second?
2	VICE-CHAIRMAN SLOVER: Second.
3	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Second. Roll call?
4	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Thank you.
5	Commissioner Grossinger?
6	COMMISSIONER GROSSINGER: Yes.
7	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI:
8	Commissioner Kenner?
9	COMMISSIONER KENNER: Yes.
10	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
11	Ortiz Gaud?
12	COMMISSIONER ORTIZ GAUD: Yes.
13	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
14	St. Jean?
15	COMMISSIONER ST. JEAN: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
17	Vann-Ghasri?
18	COMMISSIONER VANN-GHASRI: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
20	Council?
21	COMMISSIONER COUNCIL: Yes.
22	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: Commissioner
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	Slover? Chairman Albert?
2	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER MCNAIR: You have seven
4	yes. The resolution is approved.
5	CHAIRMAN ALBERT: Thank you. There is
6	no other business to come before the Board of
7	Commissioners today. The next Board of
8	Commissioners meeting will be held on Wednesday,
9	October 10th, 2018 at 1 p.m. at Highland, which is
10	at 662 Atlantic Street, S.E., Washington, D.C.
11	At this time, our meeting is adjourned.
12	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went
13	off the record at 11:02 a.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	